DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 605 VT 019 844

TITLE	An Experiment in Using Lay-Off Time for Improving Workers' Advancement Potential. Report on Two Years of the Job Advancement Training Program.
INSTITUTION	Texas Congressional District Number 24.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Research and Development.
REPORT NO	DLMA-82-34-70-31-2
PUB DATE	Oct 72
NOTE	82p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151 (DLMA-82-34-70-31-2, MF $.95, HC $3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; Demonstration Projects; *Employment Potential; Experimental Programs; Industrial Relations; *Manpower Development; Program Attitudes; Program Evaluation; Promotion (Occupational); *Remedial Programs; Vocational Counseling; *Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	Job Advancement Training Program (JAT)

ABSTRACT

The Job Advancement Training Program (JAT) was an experimental demonstration project to determine whether workers, employers, and community agencies would perceive value in and respond positively to non-skills training opportunities offered to workers during periods of temporary layoff, and also to determine if the training seemed to have increased promotion possibilities for the enrollees. Conclusions from the project experience show that temporarily laid-off workers (the primary target group) will not enroll. The program attracted relatively young and inexperienced workers on indefinite or permanent layoff. The target group perceived no job-related benefits in such training, because in most industries worker advancement and promotional systems are negotiated through the collective bargaining process which ensures advancement on the basis of seniority. Employers response to the JAT concept was minimal as they could not perceive any area of self-interest. Findings suggest that application of such a program would be of potential benefit only in industries where internal labor market practices are not ridigly tied to a worker's seniority. (MF)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 075605

AN EXPERIMENT
IN USING LAY-OFF TIME
FOR IMPROVING
WORKERS' ADVANCEMENT POTENTIAL

Report on Two Years of the
Job Advancement Training Program

United States R&D Corp.
15 Columbus Circle
New York, N.Y. 10023

VT019844

ED 075605

AN EXPERIMENT IN USING LAY-OFF TIME FOR IMPROVING WORKERS' ADVANCEMENT POTENTIAL

This report covers the two years of operation of the

Job Advancement
Training Program

Contract No. DL 82-34-70-31
Report No. DLMA82-34-70-31-2

This report on an experimental and demonstration project was prepared under a contract with the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under the authority of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Firms and organizations undertaking such projects under the Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor.

United States R&D Corp.
15 Columbus Circle
New York, New York 10023

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. DLMA 82-34-70-31-2	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle: An Experiment in Using Lay-Off Time For Improving Workers' Advancement Potential			5. Report Date: October 1972 6.
7. Author(s): William T. McGrath			8. Performing Organization Rept. No.
9. Performing Organization Name and Address: United States R&D Corporation, Gulf-Western Bldg., 15 Columbus Circle, New York, New York 10023			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No. 11. Contract/Grant No. DLMA82-34-70-31
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Office of Research and Development, 1111 20th St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20210			13. Type of Report & Period Covered: 7/1/71-6/30/72 14.

15. Supplementary Notes: Supplements Report No. SLMA82-34-70-31-1 of December 1971 entitled "Training The Laid-Off Worker"

16. Abstracts

The Job Advancement Training Center was a demonstration program which provided to a broad range of workers the opportunity to participate in job-related non-skills training during periods of temporary layoff. The conclusions drawn from the project's research and operational experience show that, in general, temporarily laid-off workers will not enroll. The program attracted relatively young, inexperienced workers, on indefinite or permanent layoff. Research showed that those truly on temporary layoff perceived no job-related rewards accruing to them as a result of participation in layoff time training. This is due to the fact that in most industries, worker advancement and promotional systems exist which have been negotiated through the collective bargaining process and which advance a man automatically on the basis of seniority alone. Thus in such industries a worker's self-improvement efforts during periods of temporary layoff can in no way either increase or decrease his probability for advancement. Employers as well as workers recognized this reality and their response to the training opportunity was therefore minimal. Those who did enroll in the program appear to have benefited in in terms of career goal definition, motivation to pursue advanced education or skills training and/or finding new and better jobs.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors

Attitudes, bargaining, counseling-vocational interests, education (includes training) employment, incentives (psychology), industrial plants, labor unions, local government, manpower requirements, manpower utilization, motivation, personnel development, personnel selection, program instruction, qualifications, questionnaires, recruiting, socioeconomic status, statistical analysis, statistical samples, surveys, unemployment, vocational guidance

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

Employment Service (State of California), Internal Labor Markets, Worker Advancement Systems, Seniority, Employment Levels, Unemployment Insurance, Lay-Off, Basic Education, Industrial Employers, Labor-force Attachment, Training Program Design, Seasonal Industries

17c. COSATI Field/Group 51

18. Availability Statement: Distribution is unlimited. Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va. 22151.	19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 73
	20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price $3.00

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
SECTION I:	ABSTRACT	1
	SUMMARY	5
SECTION II:	PROGRAM DESIGN AND OBJECTIVES	
	Pre-Program Design Considerations	16
	JAT's Objectives	19
	JAT's Specific Design Features	20
SECTION III:	OPERATIONAL OUTCOMES AND ANALYSES	
	CHAPTER ONE: WORKER RESPONSE	
	Estimated Number of Potential Enrollees	28
	Recruiting and Enrolling Workers	29
	Enrollee Characteristics	31
	CHAPTER TWO: COMMUNITY RESPONSE	
	The Community in General	39
	Local Governmental & Manpower Programs	40
	Local Unemployment Insurance Office	44
	CHAPTER THREE: EMPLOYER AND UNION RESPONSE	
	The Employers' and Unions' Roles	50
	Assistance Provided	50
	Employer Perceived Obstacles	52
	Attempting to Overcome Obstacles	53
	CHAPTER FOUR: VALUE OF TRAINING FOR THOSE WHO ENROLLED	
	Length of Stay	59
	Post-JAT Experiences	59
	Enrollee Evaluations of JAT	61
SECTION IV:	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	64
SECTION V:	APPENDICES	68

SECTION I

ABSTRACT AND SUMMARY

ABSTRACT

Purpose

The Job Advancement Training Program (JAT) was funded as an experimental demonstration project by the Office of Research and Development of the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor. JAT's purpose was to determine whether workers, employers and community agencies would perceive value in, and respond positively to non-skills training opportunities offered to workers during periods of temporary layoff. In addition to measuring the response of these different parties to participating in an actual operational program, JAT was to determine whether the training received by those temporarily laid-off workers who enrolled seemed, upon return to work, to have increased their promotional opportunities, or potential for securing jobs which were less likely to subject them to periodic layoffs. JAT's purpose then, was to determine the viability of this Layoff Time Training Concept (LOTT).

Procedures

From July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1972, United States R&D Corporation operated the Job Advancement Training Center in Antioch, California. The program offered non-skills remedial adult basic education in math, reading and literacy skills through the high school level. It also offered an optional GED course to prepare participants for high school equivalency exams. Trainer-led group discussion and

low-key sensitivity sessions were included in the program and were designed to increase trainees' self-confidence and improve attitudes toward the "world of work."

Eligibility for the program was limited to workers who had been laid off within the last six months. If worker demand for the program was greater than its ability to serve all who applied, the enrollment preference was to be given to those workers most recently laid off who had the highest probability of recall. This "preference" group was the primary and legitimate target group for whom LOTT was conceived.

Through the use of self-instructional programmed learning texts, the basic education program offered a tutorial approach to learning. This eliminated the need for scheduling class cycles and allowed a worker to enroll at any time he might be laid off; enrollees who were collecting unemployment insurance benefits received a $4 expense stipend for each day of attendance; those enrollees who were not receiving U.I. benefits were eligible for MDTA allowances, if they met the normal MDTA qualifying criteria.

The program also included a very important component designed to plan and implement ways and means to involve employers, unions and community agencies in the program and to attempt to gain their unqualified support for the LOTT concept. Finally, an intrinsic part of the project design was a research effort designed to conduct an on-going assessment of the results of

operational efforts and/or the effects on the program of outside variables which had some bearing on the outcome of operational efforts.

Results and Conclusions

Despite the project's extensive and varied recruiting efforts, very few truly temporarily laid off workers (the legitimate primary target group) enrolled in the program. In general, those who enrolled over the two-yearperiod (431 people) were younger, relatively inexperienced workers on indefinite or permanent lay-off. Few of these workers had much hope of being recalled to previous employers. Such workers, although technically laid off, were in reality unemployed. The LOTT concept was not conceived to address the problems of the unemployed, but rather advocated providing training during periods of temporary lay-off to improve the general performance and "promotability" of those who already held a job.

Employers in the area provided minimal support. They were not very responsive to the LOTT concept, because they did not perceive that it addressed itself to any real self-interest or need that they could identify. Likewise, community agencies and institutions provided only marginal cooperation. Employers saw worth in the concept only in regard to any "affirmative action" (EEO) aspects or potential it might have. Those in the community concerned with manpower problems saw the high level of minority

unemployment as the crucial problem and thus failed to see JAT as relevant to priority issues.

Research studies conducted by the project on the "internal labor market" practices of the major employers in the area eventually provided answers as to why most temporarily laid off workers and their employers saw no work related benefits accruing to them through support or participation in a LOTT program such as JAT. In most industries that are not highly seasonal, worker advancement and promotional systems exist which are negotiated through the collective bargaining process and which advance a man automatically on the basis of seniority alone. In such industries, it is improbable that a worker's self-improvement efforts during periods of temporary lay-off can either increase or decrease his chances for advancement. Employers, as well as workers, recognize this reality and their response to the training opportunity is therefore minimal.

These findings suggest that application of the LOTT concept would appear to be of potential benefit only to certain industries where "internal labor market" practices are not rigidly tied almost exclusively to a worker's seniority.

SUMMARY

Regardless of the general national economic situation, temporary, cyclical and/or seasonal layoff of workers is a regular and somewhat predictable occurrence in some industries.

Many workers who are regularly affected by such circumstances are unable to move up promotional ladders and out of the jobs that subject them to periodic layoffs, due to a lack of adequate reading, math, or language skills.

From a manpower utilization point of view, valuable human resources lie idle during such "down time." Nationwide, this phenomenon results in a considerable waste of manpower. The worker's layoff period is put to no constructive use. He does not contribute to the production of goods and services, does not earn adequate income and does not utilize this time in a way that might improve his ability to obtain a more stable job upon returning to work. Whether viewed with concern for the individual, society, or the economy, these regular periods of temporary layoff are wasteful and costly.

Examination of this phenomenon led to the creation of a unique and hypothetically viable concept in manpower development. This abstract concept contends that cyclical and/or seasonal layoff time should and can be put to constructive use by workers in a training program designed to improve their general performance and "promotability" upon return to work.

The Job Advancement Training Program (JAT) was designed as an experiment to test the viability of this concept of Layoff Time Training (LOTT) in regard to the following issues:

1. Whether and how employers, unions and workers will respond to offers of certain types of non-skills training assistance during layoff.
2. How to gear such training to employer needs and/or help to provide new opportunities for workers unable or unwilling to return to the same employer.
3. What operational problems will arise in providing training during layoffs of uncertain duration.
4. Whether and how such training is useful after return to employment.
5. What are the crucial variables that must be considered, and that may not have been identified, in determining whether this concept is accepted or not accepted and supported in a community.

From July of 1970 through June of 1972, United States R&D Corp., under contract to the Manpower Administration of the United States Department of Labor, operated the Job Advancement Training (JAT) Center to test out the viability of the Lay-Off Time Training Concept (LOTT).

The JAT experimental program was designed to serve employers and workers from the many industries surrounding the training

center located in the Antioch/Pittsburg area of Northern California.

JAT's primary target population consisted of workers exhibiting clear ties to, and identification with, a specific employer or industry and who were temporarily laid off with reasonable assurance of recall. The program design also allowed for the enrollment of a secondary target group ... workers who had been laid off, but whose work experience showed only weak employer or industry ties and whose probability for recall was somewhat remote. Enrollment of this secondary group would depend on the extent to which the training capacity of the center was not being fully utilized by the primary target group.

The program offered non-skills remedial adult basic education in math, reading and literacy skills through the high school level. In addition, it provided a complete GED course for interested enrollees as well as trainer-led group discussion and sensitivity sessions for all participants, aimed at strengthening constructive attitudes toward the world of work, sharpening interpersonal skills and building self-confidence. The program design also called for customizing this "core" curriculum with the assistance of employers so as to make it specifically relevant to the needs of their workers who enrolled.

To test the viability of this "general" approach, the JAT program would require cooperation and assistance from employers,

unions, community groups and local government agencies. The project would need the help of employers and the local state unemployment insurance office in order to identify and distinguish the primary target group from the larger undefined mass of the unemployed. Their assistance would also be crucial in contacting such workers, accurately informing them of the program and helping to motivate them to enroll.

It was desirable, although not critical for the experiment, to attempt to acquire the cooperation of other agencies and groups offering manpower services in the area. JAT might prove an added resource to them or ways might be devised whereby some of JAT's needs such as counseling or job placement might be handled through their already existing capabilities, thus reducing duplication and overlap of services. Such liaison might also set the stage for eventual assumption of responsibility by the community for an on-going LOTT program in the event it proved viable.

The program encountered many obstacles in carrying out the experiment. Not the least of these was its inability to identify and isolate members of the primary target group so as to determine their interest in the program. Although employers cooperated with project staff in many ways, they did not, in general, assist in publicizing or promoting the program to workers they were laying off, nor did they help to devise

customized curriculum specifically relevant to their plants. From the employer's perspective there was little identified need for a program such as JAT, except for potential affirmative action aspects.

The local office of unemployment insurance (U.I.) provided no greater assistance. As a result, JAT had to do its recruiting through mass media techniques and "word of mouth" endorsements by persons already enrolled.

The JAT experiment followed on the heels of an earlier program run by the contractor in the same location. The Industrial Manpower Center (IMC) was a well received and relatively successful demonstration project designed to prepare the hard-core unemployed for entry level jobs. It was assumed that the intimate contacts developed by that project with employers, agencies and the community at large would facilitate the JAT project's task.

This was true in "opening doors" and establishing and maintaining cordial relationships; it was detrimental in that many continued to think of JAT as a continuation of the IMC, some even after two years of continual "brainwashing" efforts by JAT staff. In addition, while the cautious company executives in the local unit of national corporations had received the word that minority assistance was now a necessity, no such national concern had been expressed regarding lay-off time training.

The JAT project was unable to attract a significant number of the primary target group to the program. The project staff believed that the minority oriented image of the IMC coupled with the inability of the program to communicate the true nature of JAT to the primary target group through employers and the U.I. office, contributed to the project's marginal success in attracting the primary target workers. In light of other second year findings, however, the "ghost" image of the IMC was not as critical a factor as it might have appeared.

The JAT project enrolled 431 participants over its two years of operation. Only 15 to 20 percent of these individuals fit the profile of the primary target group. In general, the opportunity was responded to by younger or semi-disadvantaged workers on permanent layoff with weak labor-force attachment. Many of them had not been in the labor force long enough prior to being laid off to qualify for U.I. benefits. The program appealed to this secondary target population ... a group of workers not yet an accepted and integral part of the mainstream of the labor force, and yet neither were they clearly part of the "hard core" unemployed. As a group, they proved to be workers about whom employers concern themselves little, except perhaps in times of low unemployment when manpower is scarce. A number of them were "small town" Vietnam veterans who had begun to drift as a result of service and post-service problems ranging from minor addiction and frustration to radically changed

views often alien in their carefully structured "home town."

For these "secondary" workers who enrolled in JAT, follow-up data indicates that they benefited somewhat from their stay in the program.

They subsequently appeared to have been able to compete in the general labor market on an equal footing with workers of longer labor force attachment and experience; a significant percentage of enrollees identified specific career goals for themselves through JAT, and became sufficiently motivated to pursue skill training or further education required for realization of their recently defined employment goals.

Despite such outcomes, these enrollees in general were not part of the primary target group for a LOTT effort. Their participation in the program and the effect the training had on them therefore are not particularly significant within the context of the abstract LOTT concept.

In the second year of operation the project was finally presented with two very clear-cut opportunities to test the response to the program of a group of workers who were all primary target group members.

The first instance involved a plant shutdown for repairs that lasted five weeks. The management agreed to sponsor a special LOTT program for about 240 of its workers, actively encouraged

participation, helped design special curriculum and allowed JAT staff to conduct a survey of employees on plant premises, prior to shutdown, to determine the level of the workers' interest. Conditions were ideal, and 50% of a sample of 65 workers expressed interest in joining the program.

When the shutdown came, only four persons enrolled. When plant operations resumed, a follow-up survey was conducted. 128 persons were interviewed and only 11 were unaware of the program that had been available to them. 66% of the workers interviewed chose to use their time for vacations, relaxing, etc.; 15% did domestic chores and 10% either worked or looked for work.

A second, almost identical opportunity arose when the Association of Western Pulp and Paper Workers agreed to sponsor their own LOTT program for temporarily laid off members. Support and cooperation from the union was ideal. 55 known laid off members were invited to enroll. No one responded.

It was clear from these controlled experiments that the program did not appeal to the primary target group. The staff looked for explanations in the program design, hypothesizing that requiring a six-hour class day of participants was unreasonable, and that this discouraged the primary target group from enrolling. It was also hypothesized that perhaps offering a slightly larger

expense stipend would make a difference, or some combination of fewer daily class hours and a more liberal expense stipend might attract more of the primary target group.

A specialized manpower research team, working with the project as a subcontractor, had a different hypothesis. Subsequent research proved their hypothesis to be correct.

Detailed studies were conducted with the full cooperation of employers, on the internal hiring, training, promotional practices, and lines of advancement within 12 plants representing four major industries in the area.

The findings provided a rational explanation of why the primary target group would not perceive any benefits from participation in JAT, nor for that matter, from any educational or training efforts that might be available to them outside of the plant. The studies uncovered the universal existence of "internal labor markets" with well-defined ladders of progression upon which workers advanced automatically as their seniority made them eligible. Hiring was, with few exceptions, confined to the entry level positions. From there a worker learned the next job through informal OJT, filling in on that job when its occupant was ill or on vacation. The system worked reasonably well for all concerned, and very few workers failed to advance when their turn came due; conversely, no one could advance in increments

of more than one step, nor could they advance until the next slot opened up and they had achieved top seniority. Thus it is understandable how temporarily laid off workers wedded to such industries would perceive no possible job-related rewards resulting from participation in JAT.

The studies also made employers' reticence to become deeply involved with the program more understandable, given no significant seasonal employment patterns and a satisfactory "internal labor market" system, with any layoffs that occur being of a cyclical nature. Such layoffs are most probably permanent, and the employer naturally has no continuing interest in workers he does not expect to recall.

Thus, despite the many detours encountered in passing through a complicated maze of conditions and events, the project was finally able to arrive at a disappointing but reliable conclusion. The LOTT concept is not a viable manpower tool for relatively non-seasonal industries where well-defined, highly-structured "internal labor markets" are a reality. This eliminates from consideration the use of any "general" approach to implementing the LOTT concept.

Future efforts should explore the worth of LOTT to specific industries of a highly seasonal nature where the existence of a highly structured internal labor market is less likely and where

automatic seniority-based advancement is improbable because of a need for very large numbers of unskilled workers at the entry level. In such industries employers insist that many entry level workers are not qualified for higher level jobs and they therefore require a seniority plus "qualified" advancement system. Under such circumstances outside training could make a difference in a worker's ability to advance by insuring that he is "qualified" when his seniority makes him technically eligible for a promotion. The future of the LOTT concept appears to be tied to this "industry specific" approach.

Careful consideration should also be given in framing national manpower policy to a government-supported local institution which prepares the so-called surplus or marginal workers, like the majority of those who enrolled in this program, for job changes to occupations which may offer more rewarding employment and greater opportunity for advancement.

SECTION II

PROGRAM DESIGN AND OBJECTIVES

PROGRAM DESIGN AND OBJECTIVES

PRE-PROGRAM DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

Upon careful consideration of the broadly defined abstract LOTT concept, a variety of possible experimental models are conceivable for testing out various aspects of the viability of the idea. The outcome of any one specific experimental program model or approach might differ markedly from another depending on numerous possible planned differences in program design and operation.

Two key factors were considered in the decision as to which approach should be tested first:

A. It seemed reasonable that the LOTT concept should first be tested through a program model, which if successful, would have the broadest possible application and potential benefit. Thus, this first experimental effort should aim at serving the needs of the broadest range of laid off workers and the greatest variety of industries in the test area.

B. Initially a program based on such a unique and unknown concept would be unlikely to find any single organizational,

institutional, union or industry sponsor. Thus the design of the first experimental model would have to plan on operating from a centrally located, somewhat independent training center, which gradually would attempt to involve local interest groups and be of service to as many laid off workers from as many employers and industries as possible.

These key considerations, then, dictated the two major design features of this first experimental attempt to implement a program based on the LOTT concept. Because these considerations led to a program design geared toward a wide range of industry, employer and worker groups, it is subsequently referred to in this report as the "general" approach to LOTT.

As of June 30, 1972, the Job Advancement Training Center (JAT) completed two years of operation. It was located in the Antioch-Pittsburg area of northern California where a considerable number of large agri-related industries are established. It appeared that seasonal layoff patterns in some of these industries regularly affected certain kinds of workers in the area, making it a suitable location for testing this "general" approach to the LOTT concept. Another important factor considered in choosing this specific site was the fact that United States R&D Corp., the

contractor for this experiment, had recently completed an effective and well-received demonstration project in the area which prepared the "hard-core" unemployed for entry level jobs (Industrial Manpower Center -- IMC). It was expected that the extensive and close employer contacts developed by the IMC would assist the LOTT experiment in achieving more rapid employer and community support and cooperation than might be the case in a new location.

JAT'S OBJECTIVES

The overall objective of the JAT experimental program has been to generate a set of learnings based on actual operational experience regarding the viability of a "general" approach to implementing the LOTT concept. Specifically, these learnings are to direct themselves toward determining:

1. Whether and how employers and workers will respond to offers of certain types of non-skills training assistance during layoff.

2. How to gear such training to employer needs and/or help to provide new opportunities for workers unable or unwilling to return to the same employer.

3. What operational problems will arise in providing training during layoffs of uncertain duration.

4. Whether and how such training is useful after return to employment.

5. What are the crucial variables that must be considered, and that may not have been identified, in determining whether this concept is accepted or not accepted and supported in a community.

JAT'S SPECIFIC DESIGN FEATURES

In July of 1970 the Job Advancement Training Center (JAT) was thus established as an independent, centrally-located training facility in Antioch, California. It was operated by USR&D Corp. under contract to the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor. It offered non-skills training to workers on layoff from the surrounding industries with the intent of finding answers to these research questions through actual operational experiences.

Within the overall framework of this "general" approach to LOTT, the major features of the JAT program design were defined as follows:

a. Eligibility (Target Group) -- Any worker in the area whose employer certifies that he has been laid off (did not quit or was not fired) within the six-month period immediately preceding his application for enrollment. Enrollment preference was to be given to the most recently laid-off applicants whose work history showed the greatest "industry identification" (ties to a given industry or employer), and who thus had the greatest probability of being recalled to that employer. The defined "preferential" group was considered to be the primary and most legitimate target population for JAT.

b. Recruitment and Referrals of Trainees -- The design of the program called for local employers, unions, and the Unemployment Insurance division of the local office of the State Employment Service to act as the major referral sources of laid-off workers to the program.

c. Curricula -- The program design provided for a basic "core" curriculum of remedial adult basic education in math, reading and literacy skills through the high school level. It also provided a complete GED curriculum for those trainees who lacked a high school diploma and wished to overcome this employment obstacle. In addition, it included trainer-led group discussions and sensitivity sessions called Human Resource Development (HRD). The HRD curriculum was aimed toward developing and strengthening positive and constructive enrollee attitudes toward the world of work, sharpening interpersonal skills, building self-confidence, and assisting individuals to think out and clearly define realistic personal career goals.

The above described "core" curriculum was determined as a result of early recommendations made by local employers regarding the general needs of the typical regularly laid-off worker.

As an important supplement to the "core" curriculum, the program design called for the on-going development of a number

of differing customized curriculum designs within these broader curriculum areas. Such a feature was desirable to insure that the knowledge acquired by individual trainees was generally relevant to the requirements for advancement within their specific plant or industry. This part of the program design required that individual employers whose workers were enrolled or might be enrolled in the future, assist and guide the JAT staff in customizing and/or expanding the core curriculum in a way that would make it specifically relevant to the jobs in their plants and to the needs of their workers.

d. Vocational Counseling -- As a result of the project's first year experience it had become evident that many enrollees needed assistance in defining realistic long-term career goals, or needed help in matching up their natural abilities and interests with jobs that would utilize them. In the second year of operation the program design provided for the inclusion of a vocational counselor on the staff.

e. Educational Methodologies -- For the basic educational areas of the curriculum the program utilized self-teaching programmed learning texts to the maximum extent possible. Enrollees were placed in small "learning groups" consisting of no more than 12 trainees. A trainer was present at all times to assist individuals with any difficulty they might

encounter in proceeding on their own through their particular programmed text. This allowed maximum flexibility, since members of the group could work in different texts at their own individual learning pace and level of ability. In addition, use of self-teaching programmed texts made it possible for a person to enroll and begin learning at any time ... his enrollment did not have to coincide with the start of an administrative class cycle.

The objectives for the HRD curriculum were pursued through group activities led by the trainer. Among the methods used were discussions, role plays, closed circuit VTR, presentations by personnel managers and guest lecturers as well as sensitivity sessions.

f. Participant Stipends and Allowances -- The program design provided for two kinds of payments to participants. The first was a stipend of four dollars per day of attendance paid to those enrollees receiving unemployment insurance benefits. This covered unusual transportation and meal expenses incurred as a result of participating in the program. The second kind of assistance available was the MDTA allowance. These allowances were paid to enrollees who were eligible for JAT, and who also met the standard eligibility criteria for MDTA funds, and who for various reasons did not have a right to a current U.I. claim.

g. Length of Enrollment -- The program design dictated no predetermined ideal length of enrollment. Participation was open-ended by necessity to allow for callback of workers to jobs, or acquisition of a new job, or going on to skill training programs or higher education. Normally, maximum participation allowed was 15 weeks, with extensions permitted up to an absolute maximum of 22 weeks for enrollees who would clearly benefit from additional time in the program.

h. Role of Employers, Unions, Local Government Agencies and Community Organizations -- The program design called for the eventual development of the following kinds of outside cooperation:

1. Employers and unions -- strongly encourage laid-off workers to enroll and personally refer them to the program; help establish training during layoff as a normal thing to do in the minds of workers; work closely with project staff in the development of customized curriculum designs geared toward the specific needs of a plant or industry; make arrangements for training to be conducted on plant or union premises; explore and devise ways in which workers who have participated can be rewarded upon return to work; help publicize the program and create a positive image for it in the community.

2. Local office of the State Employment Service -- work

closely with project staff in educating U.I. office staff as to the nature and purpose of JAT, so as to insure that participants in the program who are receiving U.I. benefits are not unjustifiably harrassed by Employment Service staff who are not familiar with or do not understand the program; alert all new U.I. claimants of the availability of the program and refer them to it; closely coordinate the employment service's counseling and job placement capabilities with the project.

3. Community organizations such as school districts, other manpower training efforts, CAP programs, Model Cities, etc. -- jointly explore with project staff possible linkages with existing programs and activities; develop understanding of unique nature of JAT and its goals and determine ways in which such a program can be a resource, and how existing programs and capabilities might eventually absorb and take over some or all of the functions of a LOTT program.

i. Operational Research -- The program design called for an internal program analysis component designed to conduct an on-going assessment of the effectiveness of the project's efforts. The resultant knowledge would assist in identifying ineffective or unrealistic operational policies and approaches and help to formulate more effective alternative strategies.

This component also insured that all relevant data generated by the day-to-day operation of the experiment would be carefully collected, recorded, analyzed and documented for purposes of eventually determining the viability of the "general" approach in implementing the LOTT concept.

A sub-contract was let by USR&D Corp. to a group of manpower specialists, headed by Dr. Curtis Aller. Their role was to conduct an independent assessment of the project. Their efforts would include research into all of the variables that have some bearing on the outcome of the experiment, but particularly on those which would not necessarily come to light through a program manager's focus on day-to-day operations of the project. Such elusive but potentially important variables would include:

1. attempting to determine the characteristics of laid off workers who do not join the program and reasons why;

2. gathering and analyzing data on the general economic profile of the area and the implications if any for the JAT project; and

3. assessing the response and significance of community and governmental organizations to the experiment and vice versa.

A novel feature of the research subcontractor's role was that

they would be a very important complement to the internal program analysis component; they too would supply ongoing information and critiques to project managers over the life of the project as a basis for modification of ineffective or unrealistic operational policies or strategies that became evident through their research.

SECTION III

OPERATIONAL OUTCOMES AND ANALYSIS

OPERATIONAL OUTCOMES AND ANALYSIS

CHAPTER ONE: WORKER RESPONSE

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF POTENTIAL ENROLLEES

Persons with valid U.I. claims, under California law, must have at least a year and one-half of labor force attachment and be laid off -- voluntary quits or discharges are not eligible. Because such persons are also coincidentally the primary target group for LOTT, the research subcontractor conducted an analysis of unemployment insurance claims filed for 1971 in the Pittsburg office of the California Department of Human Resources Development (HRD).

The purposes of this investigation were twofold; one was to compile a sample list of persons who had been laid off in 1971 in order to interview them and develop background data on the laid off population in general. The characteristics of this group could then be compared to those of JAT enrollees. Any differences in the two groups might be meaningful in drawing conclusions about the appeal of the program to workers with varying characteristics. Interviewing this control group would also provide an indication of how widely known the JAT program was among laid off workers, and how accurately they understood it.

A second purpose for the study was to attempt to estimate the number of potential enrollees that existed over the length of the program. A detailed account of the study can be found in the research subcontractor's report submitted by the contractor to the USDOL, entitled "Program Assessment, Phase II, the Job Advancement Training Program, Final Report, June 30, 1972, by Olympus Research Corporation".

From the study it is liberally estimated that over the two-year span of JAT's operation, there were 1650 distinct laid-off workers in the area who might realistically have been considered as potential enrollees. (See Appendix IV for method used in arriving at this estimate.)

RECRUITING AND ENROLLING WORKERS

The original design of JAT presumed that employers, unions and the local U.I. office would cooperate closely with the project in publicizing the program directly and personally to laid off workers and referring them to it. For reasons outlined in later sections of this report, such cooperation did not materialize to any great extent. As a result, the project had to conduct its own on-going publicity and recruitment program. Every possible publicity and recruiting technique was used. The following table shows the actual number and percentage of enrollees recruited through various methods.

TABLE I

SUMMARY
PHASE I AND PHASE II
JOB ADVANCEMENT TRAINING CENTER
July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1972

RECRUITMENT SOURCES

Source	Number Referred N=431	Percent of Total N=431
Industrial Manpower Center Graduate (word of mouth)	76	17.7
JATC Enrollee (word of mouth)	132	30.7
Newspaper (news stories and advertisements)	57	13.2
Radio & TV Announcements	7	1.7
Employment Service (California Department of Human Resources Development)	55	12.8
Direct JAT Staff/Worker Contact	22	5.1
Employers	19	4.4
Fliers Posted or distributed	18	4.2
Dept. of Social Services	7	1.7
Social Workers	12	2.3
Pittsburg Concerted Services	3	.7
Unions	8	1.9
Probation Officer	7	1.7
WIN Program	1	.2
Total Known	424	98.3
Unknown	7	1.7
	431	100.0

Almost 50% of all participants enrolled as a result of a personal endorsement they received from someone already enrolled (word of mouth), or someone who had been enrolled in the previous IMC program. Newspaper ads and stories and the local state unemployment insurance office were the only other single sources of enrollees that could be considered somewhat significant.

ENROLLEE CHARACTERISTICS

The program enrolled a total of 431 participants over its two years of operation. Fifty percent of them, however, were clearly part of JAT's marginal secondary target group in that they did not have any clear industry identification, were on "permanent" layoff, were most likely to be males in their early twenties, most likely held their last job for less than nine months, were not eligible for U.I. benefits, and received MDTA allowances while enrolled. They were eligible for the program only by virtue of having been laid off (not quit or fired) within the last six months.

The remaining 50% or enrollees (215) had longer attachment to the labor force and had held their last jobs long enough to qualify for U.I. benefits. These 215 "U.I." enrollees amount to 13% of the estimated maximum pool of 1650 primary target workers

who were laid off over the two years of the experiment.

The project found, however, that even among these "U.I." enrollees, only about 40% clearly exhibited the characteristics of the primary target group for whom LOTT was conceptually intended (those laid-off workers with a clear, somewhat extended attachment to a specific employer and industry, and with reasonable certainty of eventual recall). Thus, of the 431 workers enrolled, only about 20% clearly appeared to be part of the primary target group.

Appendix I of this report provides extensive demographic data on those who enrolled. The following table highlights some key characteristics of the JAT enrollee population which distinguish them from the overall laid-off population studies by the research subcontractor.

TABLE II

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF JAT ENROLLEES
DISTINGUISHING THEM FROM LAID-OFF POPULATION IN GENERAL

	JAT ENROLLEES	LAID-OFF POPULATION
AGE		
Under 24 years	65%	26%
25-29	12%	16%
30-34	7%	14%
35+	16%	44%
EMPLOYMENT		
Average number of jobs held in last 24 months	3.2	1.8
NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS		
0	55%	40%
1	15%	23%
2	12%	17%
3	8%	9%
4+	10%	11%
Average Number	1	1.4
ETHNICITY		
Anglo	57%	68%
Black	22%	15%
Mexican American	18%	15%
Other	3%	2%
SEX		
Male	82%	67%
Female	18%	33%

In relation to the laid-off population, persons under 24 years of age were heavily over-represented in the JAT population; persons over 30 were significatly under-represented in the program. Those who enrolled in JAT had held an average of 3.2 different jobs in the previous 24 months, whereas the average for the overall laid-off population was only 1.8 jobs. JAT enrollees were more likely to be supporting no dependents, and more likely to be male, than those in the laid-off population at large. Finally, the ethnic composition of the JAT population tended to have somewhat fewer Anglos and more minorities in its ranks than were found in the laid-off group as a whole.

Obviously the program was not responded to be many workers from the primary target group. The high average number of jobs held by JAT enrollees over the last 24 months alone would suggest that few of them had developed any identification with a given employer and in general had weak labor force attachment. Other statistics collected by the project also indicated that 75% of those who enrolled declared themselves to be on indefinite or permanent layoffs. In contrast, the primary target group would be on temporary layoff with reasonably assured recall.

SOME ANSWERS APPEAR

These realities were recognized early in the project. By the end of the first year, neither the staff nor the research subcontractor

could offer any definitive explanation of why the program was not being responded to by the primary target group. It was suspected that part of the reason related to the fact that knowledge of the program was not reaching the primary candidates because neither employers nor the U.I. office were lending much assistance to publicize the program and recruit enrollees. In addition, the staff had no way of identifying and contacting a reliable sample of primary candidates to assess their attitudes without the close assistance of employers and the U.I. office. On the other hand, the secondary target group learned more quickly of the program through personal contact with ex-IMC enrollees and the local "grapevine" of the younger generation.

The questions that had to be answered were: Do workers in the primary target group know of the program? Do they understand it accurately? If so, why don't they respond? If they know of it, would response be different if their employers encouraged participation and were obviously involved with the program? Would their unions' support make a difference?

The program went into its second year determined to answer such questions. Through constant effort the project was able to take advantage of two excellent opportunities which arose for developing some clear answers.

During the second year of operation the Glass Containers Corporation informed the project that they would be shutting down their plant for four to five weeks in order to rebuild the furnaces. All but 30% of the plant's 350 production workers would be laid off. The management agreed to co-sponsor a special LOTT program for these workers, provided JAT with curriculum recommendations and strongly urged workers to participate through company bulletins, posters and notices included in each worker's final paycheck. It was arranged for JAT staff to conduct a formal survey of workers on the plant premises prior to shutdown to determine how many employees indicated interest in enrolling. Sixty-three employees were interviewed and half of them expressed definite interest.

This situation provided a controllable test of the appeal of the program to the program's primary target group under ideal conditions of employer support.

When the shutdown came, only four persons applied for the program. A follow-up survey was initiated in the plant after it had resumed operations in order to determine how workers had chosen to use their time, and whether they had been aware of the program. Of a possible 240 workers, 128 were interviewed. The results showed that only 11 persons were unaware of the program that had

been offered to them. Sixty-six percent of the workers interviewed indicated they spent the time relaxing, hunting or fishing, on short vacations or other miscellaneous leisure-time pursuits; 15% did domestic chores; 10% either worked or looked for temporary employment.

An opportunity for a similar experiment arose when the Association of Western Pulp and Paper Workers Union agreed to sponsor a LOTT program for its members in its own union hall. Again the conditions were good. The union publicized the program widely, gave it full support as being its own program and helped JAT staff contact 55 members on temporary layoff. Again there was virtually no response to the opportunity. A complete account of these experiments and their findings can be found in the contractor's quarterly reports to the USDOL on Phase II of JAT.

As a result of these two experiments it had become clear that the primary group of target workers for LOTT with industry identification and on temporary layoff with assured recall, would not choose to use their layoff time for training.

The project's initial reaction was to look at the program design as being at fault. Fifty percent of the Glass Containers workers interviewed in the pre-plant shutdown sample had expressed interest in joining. It was hypothesized that requiring of enrollees

six hours a day was unrealistic, or perhaps the latent interest in self-improvement would be more likely to result in enrollment if stipends were increased; perhaps some combination of more flexible hours and varying stipends would attract them.

As the JAT staff considered such possibilities, the research subcontractor had some very different ideas. Its hypothesis was that the reason for lack of motivation to enroll stemmed from the possible existence in these industries of internal administrative and contractual hiring, training and advancement procedures that operate automatically and effectively for all parties concerned on the basis of straight seniority. If such highly structured "internal labor markets" exist, then both employers and workers would perceive no benefit to be gained from any training, no matter how relevant, outside of this system.

This hypothesis was subsequently tested through research into the employer/union practices established in all of the major industries of the area. It proved to be an accurate explanation for the lack of response coming from the primary group of workers for whom LOTT was conceived. This research is detailed in the "employer response" section of this report.

CHAPTER TWO: COMMUNITY RESPONSE

THE COMMUNITY IN GENERAL

The JAT project encountered many obstacles to developing genuine support and a clear understanding of the JAT project on the part of local community organizations and governmental agencies.

It was thought that JAT, having followed in the footsteps of the IMC program, would benefit from the generally favorable community-wide contacts and relationships the IMC had developed while preparing the "hard core" unemployed for entry level jobs. This, however, proved to be a mixed blessing, with the negatives often outweighing the positives; having the contacts was very helpful in arranging appointments and getting employers, community leaders and heads of local government agencies to set time aside to discuss JAT. The association with the IMC was diversionary and counter-productive in that despite repeated and careful explanations by JAT staff, many of these same people persisted over a year in conceiving of the JAT program as a continuation of the IMC. To the consternation of project staff, some of these parties still do not clearly understand the very different purposes and goals of JAT.

It is not surprising, then, to find that many residents of the

community also had a distorted conception of JAT as being a program for members of poor minority groups. The JAT program was plagued by this image and project staff believe that it partially contributed to the program's inability to attract the primary target group of laid-off workers. Such workers do not generally conceive of themselves as poor or disadvantaged and thus many would be reticent to join a program that was thought to be directed toward such persons. Conversely, vestiges of the IMC image attracted those laid-off workers who had little labor market experience and no true industry identification. Many of these workers were only marginally outside of the "disadvantaged" or "hard core" unemployed group -- the only distinction being that they had been recently employed, usually for less than a year, and were in fact laid off and thus eligible for JAT.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND MANPOWER PROGRAMS

The JAT design ideally called for the creation of linkages with existing community agencies and governmental programs concerned with manpower utilization. The JAT staff made periodic efforts to explore with these groups ways in which manpower programs and services administered by them could be linked up to, and coordinated with JAT. A "linkage" might consist merely of making sure that JAT clearly understood the agency's legitimate

client group and the services it provided and vice versa so that a mutual exchange of referrals could take place. For others it might mean sitting down with JAT staff to seriously consider ways in which one or more of the existing agencies or groups might eventually administer part or all of the services of a LOTT program in order to avoid duplicating services already available.

The efforts resulted in little success. Part of the reason relates to the fact that these agencies and organizations are primarily concerned with their own immediate internal operational problems and do not feel they have time to spend considering vague possibilities for "linkages" they intuitively feel would merely add complications to present problems. In addition, as pointed out by JAT's research subcontractor as a result of interviews with the spokesman for each of these groups:

> "Each of these agencies has a point of view on manpower or economic development and each has a constituency. These constituencies range from employers, to unions, to taxpayers, to central business district landholders to black and Italian ethnic communities.
>
> "Not surprisingly, many of these agencies now receive, or are trying to get, public funds to conduct programs

> in this area directed toward their constituency. The similarities of these actual or proposed programs in terms of objectives and methods of approach suggest that ... linkages could prevent duplications, gaps, and make efficient use of resources. Such linkages are absent among existing programs. On the contrary, most agencies regarded their sister agencies as ineffectual or misguided. It is therefore not too surprising that JAT failed to make such linkages."

The research team also found that the attitudes of the community agencies toward JAT ranged from "outright hostility to mildly favorable comment."

The greatest hostility came from one of the adult education programs of the local school system, which is traditionalist in its orientation. Its spokesman did not appear concerned about the area's economic distress or employment problems. He regarded unemployment as a personal problem of individuals who "would not conform to employer standards" (of appearance, hair length, etc.). The research team's report concludes:

> "Hostility from such a source may be the reaction to the threat implicit in JAT, which in this context must be regarded as innovative, attempting to be responsive

to community needs and independent of old constituencies. That JAT failed to have any impact on the adult education bureaucracy is partly a reflection of the difficulty of the goal."

Five other agencies in the area provided various kinds of manpower services to the community. These included the California Department of Human Resources Development (HRD) (State Employment Service); the Social Service Office (county welfare agency); Concerted Services (local CAP agency); the Pittsburg Model Cities program, which has a contract with HRD to supply manpower services in its area; and the Urban League, which has a minority oriented OJT program.

The JAT project could have been a resource to any of these agencies but little interest was shown when they were approached by project staff. The research team found through their interviews that these agencies did not fully understand the LOTT experimental concept, even though one agency spokesman had participated on the JAT Advisory Board. Most were skeptical about approaches to manpower programming apart from their own programs; all of them were essentially neutral about JAT except the Urban League, which was mildly favorable. All of these agencies were aware of the seriousness and breadth of the unemployment problem in the area. Their neutrality toward JAT in part reflects a

feeling that the program's scale and its focus, limiting it to laid-off workers, make it a marginal effort when compared to the magnitude of the problems.

A positive and cooperative response from these manpower service agencies was desirable and would have facilitated the project's task to some extent. Their response, however, in the final analysis was not considered to be of crucial importance to the eventual success or failure of the experiment.

LOCAL U.I. OFFICE

The latter was not true, however, of one agency, the local office of the unemployment insurance (U.I.) section of the California Department of Human Resources Development. It was from this agency, as well as from employers and unions, that the JAT project expected to obtain all referrals to the program.

Second only to employers and unions, the U.I. office is the most logical source of referrals of "primary" target group workers for a LOTT program. This is so because U.I. payments under California laws are, with few exceptions, distributed only to laid-off persons with a year and one-half of labor force attachment. Voluntary quits or discharges are not eligible. Thus, most workers with a valid U.I. claim would also be part of the

primary target group for JAT. The U.I. office would have regular weekly contact with every potential JAT enrollee in the entire area. It would seem a simple matter for U.I. staff to inform them of the program and refer them to the training center for further information.

In addition, cooperation and a sympathetic attitude toward JAT from the U.I. office would be important to insure that U.I. office staff did not misinterpret a claimant's participation in the JAT program as disqualifying him for continued U.I. benefits under seek-work requirements of the U.I. laws.

Finally, over the long run, any successful LOTT program would ideally be designed in a way that it could rely on receiving special counseling and job-placement services for participants through the existing capabilities of the U.I. office. With this in mind, it was desirable for JAT to attempt to make the U.I. office a "partner" in the experiment so that in the event that the concept proved viable, it would already have proponents for it within the U.I. system. The degree of cooperation of the local U.I. office, then, could very clearly facilitate or hamper the project's efforts to carry out a thorough test of the LOTT concept.

Prior to initiating the program, the project staff met with the

head of the U.I. system at the state level. He was briefed on the program and asked to pledge the support and assistance of the Pittsburg U.I. office. His response was largely non-committal, stating that he would recommend that the Pittsburg office cooperate "within the limits of their allowed flexibility under U.I. laws." He also assured the project, in writing, that a worker's participation in the program would not invalidate his U.I. claim so long as he did not receive payments from the program that could be construed as being more than required to cover reasonable meal and transportation costs; the program schedule was such as to allow him to continue to seek new employment and participate in employment interviews; and participants were ready and willing to leave the program in the event an employment opportunity arose.

The local U.I. office staff were continually briefed and rebriefed on JAT over the entire length of the experiments. They were aware that JAT's daily program schedule for U.I. enrollees and the expense stipends paid to them complied with the requirements outlined at the state level for insuring continued eligibility.

The degree of cooperation received was less than ideal. The U.I. staff, although always cordial to JAT representatives, were

unenthusiastic about the concept and made little effort to refer U.I. claimants to the program. Like many others in the community, the U.I. staff for a while continued to think of JAT as the IMC and explained their lack of referrals by saying, "not too many of those kind of people have valid U.I. claims." Thus, instead of mentioning the program to all U.I. claimants and letting them look into it and decide, the U.I. staff tended to inform only those few who they felt needed a "hard core" program. Even after they clearly understood the nature of the LOTT concept they were highly skeptical of its worth and provided no greater referral cooperation.

Nor was the JAT project able to develop any "customized" linkages of counseling or job placement services with that agency. Project staff were informed by the U.I. office that U.I. recipients in the JAT program were already getting such services, just as all U.I. claimants do.

In addition, the behavior of the U.I. office toward U.I. claimants enrolled in the program appears to have been inhibitory. They could have merely required participants to demonstrate they had "registered for work," were able and available for work, were "reachable" at JAT for job offers, and were attending on a schedule allowing time for job searches. Frequently, however, the U.I. office chose to interrogate a participant in

a way which implied his integrity was in question, seeming to suggest that enrollment in JAT might invalidate his U.I. claim.

The lack of referral assistance from the local U.I. office also relates to the basic philosophy in which the U.I. concept is rooted, and the way in which this philosophy is translated into strict operational procedures within the bureaucracy.

U.I. policy makes it clear that benefits are to be understood by all sides as a <u>right</u> of a laid-off worker who has been "insured." If "premiums" were paid, then he is entitled to collect when laid off and should be encouraged to do so. Certainly nothing should be done in the administration of the payments that might suggest to him that he is considered a welfare case, getting something through charity.

The U.I. system thus perceives that it can have only one legitimate function and mandate which flows from its clear-cut single purpose: to administer payments as efficiently, unobtrusively and quickly as possible, being careful not to bother a claimant unduly in any way that might undermine his self-image or dignity.

Referring claimants to any program is perceived by U.I. staff as a violation of this basic philosophy, since in their minds such a referral might imply to the claimant that he is somewhat less

than self-sufficient and that he must attempt to speed up his return to work and stop taking a "free ride" on U.I. benefits.

As stated by the spokesman for the local U.I. office, "this very simply is not their role," even if some persons do in fact need such help. In principle, referral of claimants was perceived as a violation of the spirit and intent of the U.I. concept.

The lesson is clear. The U.I. system is one that goes strictly by the books. There is little or no room for the flexibility needed to experiment with new ideas or changes on a local level. This highly bureaucratic system can respond to change or innovation only through decisions at the state policy level. Local managers and staff appear to have little or no discretionary authority to accommodate their operations even slightly to the needs of a potentially worthwhile project such as JAT, nor, if they have been in the system long enough, are they personally disposed to do so.

CHAPTER THREE: EMPLOYER AND UNION RESPONSE

THE EMPLOYERS' AND UNIONS' ROLES

From the outset, and over the entire life of the JAT experiment, extensive and continued efforts were made to co-opt strong assistance and support for the program from employers and unions in the area. They would have to play an important role in any effective LOTT program. On them would depend timely referral of laid-off workers to the program, increased motivation of workers to enroll, development of industry or plant-specific curriculum for their workers, and through their visible connection to the project they would help to create a positive and constructive image for the program in the community at large.

ASSISTANCE PROVIDED

Employers were generally supportive and sympathetic of the worthwhile goals of the abstract idea. However, they usually did not see it as practical or relevant to their specific operations. They established and maintained amiable relationships with project staff, frequently set time aside to discuss the program and its progress with JAT managers and at a minimum were willing to consider ways in which they might assist the experiment. Many employers donated their time to participate

in monthly meeting of the JAT Advisory Board, and they cooperated in providing information requested of them for the project's research efforts into their internal hiring and advancement procedures.

Employers did not, however, except in a few isolated instances, promote the program to workers they were laying off, nor did they personally refer workers to the program. They did not provide JAT staff with any significant direction for customizing curriculum content so it would be specifically relevant to the needs of laid-off workers from their plants. In short, direct assistance in attracting and training laid-off workers from their plants was usually not provided.

By the end of the project's first year of operation it had become clear that most employers could not at that point envision any genuine needs or self-interests being served through a LOTT program. Despite continued efforts, only one employer and one union eventually provided the kind of meaningful support required. This resulted in the Glass Containers' and AWPPW experiments(reported on earlier in this report)which took place in JAT's second year of operation.

EMPLOYER PERCEIVED OBSTACLES

Individually, many large employers explained their lack of referral and curriculum development assistance by saying that they no longer experienced regular seasonal layoffs. They claimed to have adjusted their production schedules, product lines and warehousing in a way that minimizes the old seasonal patterns of production. Any temporary layoffs that might occur are of very short duration and would not provide adequate time for meaningful training. Most layoffs, they explained, are due to cyclical declines and workers laid off are not likely to be called back. Such workers are always the most recently hired and have not become of great value to the employer, nor does he generally feel any great attachment to them. When they are laid off, they are, in the minds of employers, merely a part of the unemployed labor pool. Employers feared that referring such workers to a program that offered a curriculum obviously relevant to their plant might well lead the worker to believe that there was an implied commitment on the part of the employer to reward him through recall or advancement.

Holding such views, employers, in general, did not believe the LOTT concept addressed itself to remedying any pressing need they could identify. On the other hand, many of them were somewhat apprehensive that strong ties to the program and highly

visible and public support of it could in fact cause them unnecessary problems. JAT's first year report identified these employer apprehensions:

> "How far employers are willing to go in openly endorsing the concept has proved to be limited by their concern that such an endorsement will imply to workers a commitment to recall them, or in the event of recall, to advance them on the basis of their participation in JAT. Employers fear such interpretations could cause misunderstandings with unions about the employers' intentions to honor seniority-based recall, hiring and advancement agreements."

ATTEMPTING TO OVERCOME THE OBSTACLES

As a result of the first year findings, it was recommended that in the second year of the experiment...

> "efforts to develop meaningful acceptance and support of a layoff time training program must deal with the issues of employer and union support as a single integrated issue. This need be done by bringing together an employer and his workers' union in order that they attempt to reach mutual agreements in relation to supporting and encourageing layoff time training and

and determining areas of allowable flexibility under 'promotion' clauses of collective bargaining agreements for workers who enroll."

This avenue of union assistance was actively pursued during JAT's second year of operation but with no ultimate success. As explained elsewhere in this report, the Association of Western Pulp and Paper Workers did cooperate intimately with the project in attempting to establish a union sponsored LOTT program specifically for its laid-off members. Worker response was negligible.

During the second year of operation, as a result of the Glass Containers' and AWPPW experiments, it became apparent to the project's research subcontractor that a careful study and understanding of the local employers' internal hiring, training and promotional practices might help to provide a more rational explanation of employers' and employees' behavior and response toward the program and might even lead to insights on how to tap their self-interest. As a result, the JAT staff, with the cooperation of employers, carried out an investigation into the internal administrative and contractual hiring and advancement procedures of 12 leading employers. The information gathered dealt with specific hiring practices, entry points, promotion

policies, progression systems, training needs and recent layoff experience.

Analysis of the data gathered showed evidence of cyclical decline in overall employment but no indication of significant seasonal layoff patterns. Initial hiring was largely confined to clearly identified entry jobs and most new hires were in their early twenties. For those who stayed, promotion channels followed well-defined progression lines. Advancement depended on straight seniority and a trial period on the new job. Job skills were learned informally through filling in at the next job level during periods in which the worker in that position was ill or on vacation. Workers were often screened before hiring to insure they possessed functional educational levels adequate for learning higher level jobs when their seniority made them eligible for such. Once in this system, it was rare that a worker failed to advance automatically when his turn came due.

It became understandable then, how an employer or a worker connected with such a system would see little value in a LOTT program; even if a worker were temporarily laid off, training during layoff could make no difference in his rate of advancement. He was learning the skills for the next job while employed and when called back he would automatically get the next job when he became

most senior in line and the position opened up. Outside training could in no way influence a worker's advancement within such a closed system.

These previously unrecognized realities also explained to a large extent the reasons for the lack of worker response in the Glass Containers and AWPPW experiments.

For all of these companies the concept of an internal labor market was a reality. For all practical purposes the entry job was the only crucial one. Thereafter, an individual advanced in response to the system's rules prescribing employee rights to promotion when opportunities arose. For example, one utility with close to 500 employees reported four major lines of progression with 90% of all new hires entering one of these lines at the entry level. This company felt it attracted ample supplies of applicants and experienced very low turnover rates. It saw no way the project could be of value to the company.

The research subcontractor conducted a deeper probe into employer practices. Four major sectors, steel, chemicals, glass and paper, were studied. For most of these companies, contact by JAT staff was frequent and knowledge of the program and a sympathetic disposition were assumed.

Eight companies were contacted and all cooperated. Each was

interviewed for one to two hours. In addition to the kinds of information gathered from other employers by the JAT staff regarding hiring, training, lines of progression, promotion and layoff, the research team also collected supplementary material such as union contracts, training material, and affirmative action plans for later study.

The results of these efforts are reported on in some detail in the research team's report submitted by the contractor to the Department of Labor entitled, "Program Assessment, Phase II, the Job Advancement Training Program, Final Report, June 30, 1972" by Olympus Research Corporation.

Simply stated, the interviews provided massive support of the earlier findings of the JAT staff showing the existence of well-defined internal labor market structures which could not normally be affected by external training such as LOTT.

Over the entire length of the JAT experiment employers constantly stressed that what they really need is a program like the previous project, the "Industrial Manpower Center," which prepared minority and "hard core" unemployed for entry level jobs. Many employers felt this so strongly that they seemed to resist understanding the true nature of JAT, and in their minds continued to think of JAT as the IMC. Only after a year of operation did the staff begin to succeed in getting employers to understand the very different goals and intent of JAT and begin to get a reliable response from them in relation to it.

It was only in the experiment's second year, after conducting the studies into the hiring and promotional systems of employers, that it became clear why employers saw the IMC program as fulfilling a real manpower need and why they perceived little benefit or relevancy in JAT. IMC fit the realities of their internal labor market practices. IMC training was directed toward impacting the system at the only point where outside efforts could impact it -- the entry level. Even the IMC program could be effective only because employers had a felt need to change the racial mix of the manpower flow in, and wanted a better source of candidates than they might get by hiring "blindly off the street.

As the JAT project's research subcontractor concluded,

> "this is a reminder that race has been at the center of manpower policy for a decade now. Established manpower utilization practices have been modified when an underlying racial cast brought a manpower problem to the surface. What emerges from this study of employers is that layoff time training will probably become viable in employers' eyes only if racial aspects of current manpower utilization make it relevant. The need to upgrade minorities who become dead-ended at, or barely above the entry point might be the stimulus. Such workers already in the system and on layoff might emerge as a much sought after group."

CHAPTER FOUR: VALUE OF TRAINING FOR THOSE WHO ENROLLED

LENGTH OF STAY

Enrollees' attendance at JAT averaged 34 class days and average length of enrollment was 40 class days, with the difference between the two averages being accounted for by absences for employment interviews, illness and personal business. Appendix II gives a more detailed analysis of enrollment and attendance patterns.

The primary reasons given by enrollees for separation from the program can be classified into several broad categories: 12% completed the maximum allowed time in the program (15 to 22 weeks); 43% left because they were either recalled to their old job, or found a new one, or felt it necessary to leave the program to conduct a full-time job search; 6% stated they were going to join a specific skill training program or enter college; and 21% were terminated for cause, primarily due to absenteeism or being found not to qualify after having been enrolled.

POST JAT EXPERIENCES

Follow-up was conducted on participants 90 days after leaving the program to attempt to determine the effect of JAT upon them through an examination of their subsequent labor market experiences. The project was able to reach 336 of the 431 persons who had been enrolled. A complete breakdown of this data is

included as Appendix III of this report. The following table compares the project's follow-up data with similar data compiled by the research subcontractor on the random sample of 88 U.I. claimants who did not enroll and who were laid off for two or more weeks in 1971. (Some of the key characteristics differentiating JAT enrollees from the sample of non-enrolled U.I. claimants are identified and compared on pages 30 and 31 of this report.)

	Ex-enrollees	Sample of non-enrolled laid-off workers
	N-336	N-88
Employed	58%	56%
Enrolled in college or skill training programs	9%	4%
	67%	60%
Unemployed	33%	40%
	100%	100%
Average wage increase from previous job for those employed	+14¢/hr.	+20¢/hr.

Ex-enrollees were slightly more likely to be employed at the time of this follow-up than non-enrollees, but not significantly so. The employed ex-enrollees, however, did not average as great a wage increase on their new jobs as the employed non-enrollees. Given the fact that JAT attracted the secondary target group of workers with relatively weak labor force attachment and experience, their subsequent labor market experience compares favorably with the control group of more experienced workers. This

might suggest that JAT was of some assistance to them in competing in the labor market on a more equal footing against more experienced and confident workers. It is also significant to note that at time of follow-up ex-enrollees were less likely to be unemployed and more likely to be enrolled in college or skill training programs than the non-enrollee sample group. The JAT staff is confident that this reflects the value of JAT in guiding enrollees toward defining career objectives and motivating them toward acquiring the necessary knowledge, skills and certification needed to reach those employment goals.

ENROLLEES' EVALUATIONS OF JAT

As part of their work, the research subcontractor interviewed a sample of 77 ex-enrollees. Through a series of semi-structured questions posed in the course of the interviews, information on enrollee views of JAT was developed. About 85% of those interviewed recalled something specific about the training. When asked what they expected from JAT upon entering, responses ranged from "a stipend" to "a GED certificate" to "skill training." The responses can be generally categorized as follows:

Response	%
To get general education	39
To get skill training	10
To improve English	3
To get GED	6
To get a stipend	29
Other	13

Almost a third of the enrollees in the sample group stated that they had enrolled primarily to receive the stipend. JAT staff quickly spotted many of these individuals through their poor attendance and evident lack of learning motivation. 21% of all enrollees were terminated administratively for such reasons, and they tended to be the same individuals who had enrolled only to draw the stipend.

10% of the ex-enrollee sample group stated that they expected to acquire some specific skills as a result of participation in JAT. Such misconceptions are curious since each enrollee, before joining, was clearly informed that JAT would provide no such opportunity but would focus on improving the basic learning tools of math, reading, literacy and human relations and help to develop constructive and productive attitudes toward the world of work. The responses of these workers is perhaps an indication of how strongly they desired a skill training opportunity, regardless of whether JAT offered such.

When asked "did you get what you expected from the program?", 72% said yes and 28% said no. The no's are partially accounted for by those who hoped for skill training and did not get it. Others had not clearly defined what they hoped to achieve through JAT in the first place.

When asked if they would attend such a program again, about 75% said yes (almost the same percentage who said that they got what they expected from JAT). When the question was rephrased to ask,

"would you attend again if you could be trained for anything?", 90% said yes, again reflecting a strong general desire for skill training.

Most enrollees were non-committal when asked about the training ... "you get out of it what you put into it." Some termed it "too easy" or "too general" while others could see benefits in the generality saying that it provided "good background." Most enrollees liked the instructors and found them to be friendly and concerned.

From the somewhat limited data available on enrollees' evaluations of their JAT experiences and the more complete follow-up information on their post-JAT labor market experiences, there are indications that enrollees in general perceived varying degrees of value in their participation in the program. As a result of their participation it appears that they were able to compete favorably for jobs in the labor market against workers with longer labor force attachment and greater self-assurance. For some enrollees, participation in JAT provided career direction and the motivation necessary to complete further education required for achievement of their identified employment goals.

The achievements of the JAT training effort, however, relate for the most part to the secondary target populations and not to the worker for whom the LOTT concept is primarily intended. Consequently, the outcomes are of secondary interest and have little significance in terms of the strictly defined LOTT concept.

SECTION IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

The JAT experiment has demonstrated that the "general" approach to implementing programs based on the abstract LOTT concept is not viable. The key premise upon which this approach is built postulates that a broad range of employers, unions and workers, as well as community institutions, will perceive value in, and respond positively to, non-skills training opportunities during periods of temporary layoff. This proved to be invalid.

Although the project was hampered by serious problems in its efforts to obtain the desired degree of employer, union, community and local governmental support, including confusion caused by the preceding IMC, the evidence supporting such an unqualified conclusion is sufficient.

Had the JAT project achieved nothing more than to create the opportunities for conducting the Glass Containers and AWPPW experiments -- which <u>did</u> enjoy optimum conditions for testing the appeal of the program concept to workers of the primary target group -- then the resulting evidence would strongly indicate that the concept held little appeal for the primary worker group.

Those experiments in and of themselves did not provide a clear answer as to why primary target workers won't respond. Coupled, however, with the research that confirmed the almost universal existence in non-seasonal industries of highly-structured and well-defined automatic training and advancement practices based

on straight seniority, the picture becomes complete. Based on these learnings, there should remain no doubt about the validity of the stated conclusions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Any future LOTT efforts must establish very specific and clearly defined participant selection criteria so that enrollment is limited strictly to the most legitimate primary target workers, leaving no room for enrollment of a "secondary" target group. Allowing the enrollment of such a group in the JAT experiment was distracting. Had it not existed, the project might have come to grips more quickly with the key central issues that eventually emerged as a determinant of the viability of a "general" approach to providing LOTT to the primary target group.

2. The JAT experience suggests that it is not always wise to build one kind of project on another in hopes of exploiting community credibility for the new but different project. It proved to be a mixed blessing, with the "negatives" outweighing the "positives."

3. If LOTT is to prove a viable concept, its future lies in a more limited "industry specific" approach. The worth of LOTT as a manpower tool seems to be tied only to specific industries of a highly seasonal nature with loosely defined internal labor market practices and with a workforce whose

characteristics and deficiencies would make the training of clearly perceived worth to all parties concerned. This "industry specific" recommendation relates to the fact that in certain industries there do not exist highly structured internal labor markets such as those encountered in this experiment. Such industries are highly labor intensive and show extreme seasonal employment patterns requiring large numbers of workers for primarily unskilled entry level positions during the season.

The need to double or triple the regular workforce to meet seasonal production patterns makes it impractical for an employer to screen applicants for skills needed for positions above the entry level. As a result, one does not find rigid or highly structured advancement procedures based solely on seniority... employers would not be willing to live with the results of automatically advancing persons whom they had hired indiscriminately for the sole purpose of performing unskilled entry level jobs during the season. In such a situation, employers require the option to advance the most senior and qualified person, with a great deal of latitude in determining who is or is not qualified. Outside hiring for positions above the entry level is also allowed, when an employer determines that none of his present workforce is "qualified."

In such an industry many members of this large, unskilled workforce fail to advance due to correctable basic educational deficiencies. Frequently these same individuals also identify with

the industry for better or worse because it is the only work they believe they can get. They would certainly be considered "disadvantaged," and more often than not are members of an ethnic minority group.

The LOTT concept might well serve the common needs of the employer, the union, and the worker in such industries, especially if the union were bargaining for stricter seniority-based advancement procedures or if there existed strong outside pressure on employers to advance members of the minority groups. Future LOTT efforts should be implemented within the "industry specific" context.

SECTION V

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

SUMMARY
PHASE I and PHASE II
JOB ADVANCEMENT TRAINING CENTER
July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1972

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SUMMARY (N=431)

1. Town of Residence

Antioch	28.7
Pittsburg	44.2
Oakley	5.9
Concord	8.6
Brentwood	4.8
Bethel Island	.5
Knightsen	.7
Richmond	.5
Martinez	3.6
Walnut Creek	.7
Pleasant Hill	1.4
Crockett	.2
Pacheco	.2

2. Sex

Male	81.9
Female	18.1

3. Race

Anglo	57.1
Black	22.0
Mex/Amer.	17.6
Other	3.3

4. Age

Under 20	24.8
20-24	39.5
25-29	12.5
30-34	7.0
35+	16.2

5. Military Status

Served	25.5
Eligible	29.9
Exempt	18.3
Not Applicable	23.0
Unknown	3.3

6. Marital Status

Married	35.5
Single	50.1
Divorced	8.4
Separated	5.1
Widowed	.9

7. Number of Dependents

0	54.8
1	15.3
2	12.1
3	7.9
4	4.9
5	2.0
Over 5	3.0

8. Number in Household

1	10.1
2	18.7
3	22.0
4	18.0
5	10.8
6	8.2
7	4.9
Over 7	7.3

9. Head of Household

Self	48.5
Parent	36.0
Other	14.8
Unknown	.7

10. Rents or Owns Home

Rents	79.1
Owns	18.8
Unknown	2.1

11. Own Car

Yes	70.1
No	29.9

12. Households Receiving UI

Yes	50.6
No	49.4

13. Households Receiving Welfare

Yes	21.8
No	77.0
Unknown	1.2

14. Receiving MDTA 42.7

15. Received Stipend 57.3

16. Last Employment Job Type

Laborer	41.5
Assembly	10.2
Retail	10.7
Office	3.5
Janitor	3.2
Skilled	17.2
Other	13.7

17. Average Number of Jobs in Last 24 Months 3.2

18. Pre-Training Job Wage Average (based on 158 ex-enrollees now employed) $3.05

19. Post-Training Job Wage Average (based on 158 ex-enrollees now employed) $3.19

20. Average Wage Increase (based on 158 ex-enrollees now employed) $ .14

21. Average Days Attended 34 days
6.8 wks.

22. Highest Grade Completed

12	57.1%
11	19.0
10	10.7
9	5.4
8	3.9
Less than 8	3.9

23. Received Other Training Prior to JAT

Yes	30.9
No	68.4
Unknown	.7

24. Pre-Training Test Scores (175 Trainees)

Word Meaning	7.5
Paragraph Meaning	7.4
Arith. Applications	7.8
Arith. Computation	6.8

Average = 7.4

25. Post-Training Test Scores

Word Meaning	8.4
Paragraph Meaning	8.0
Arith. Applications	8.5
Arith. Computation	8.2

Average = 8.3

26. Average Grade Increase

Word Meaning	.9
Paragraph Meaning	.4
Arith. Applications	.6
Arith. Computation	1.2

Average = .8

SUMMARY
PHASE I and PHASE II
JOB ADVANCEMENT TRAINING CENTER
July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1972

CLASSIFICATION OF PARTICIPANTS ACCORDING TO
LENGTH OF ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE
N=405

Number of Weeks	Enrolled*		Attended**	
1 week or less	71	(17.5%)	87	(21.5%)
More than 1, up to 3	56	(13.8%)	62	(15.3%)
More than 3, up to 5	57	(14.1%)	56	(13.8%)
More than 5, up to 7	40	(9.9%)	40	(9.9%)
More than 7, up to 10	52	(12.8%)	41	(10.1%)
More than 10, up to 13	19	(4.7%)	27	(6.7%)
More than 13, up to 15	55	(13.6%)	47	(11.6%)
More than 15	55	(13.6%)	45	(11.1%)

* Weeks enrolled is merely the difference between the starting date and date of departure of a participant.

** Weeks attended are calculated by counting only those full days a participant is present in class and dividing this sum by five.

JOB ADVANCEMENT TRAINING CENTER
July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1972

Post Participation Employment Status of Enrollees

Post-JAT Status	All Enrollees N=336	Enrollees staying less than 15 weeks N=299	Enrollees staying max. 15-22 weeks N=37
Returned to old job	12.5%	13.4%	5.4%
New employment	45.0%	45.8%	37.8%
Entered College	5.5%	5.0%	8.1%
Entered other educational program	3.0%	3.3%	0
Military	1.0%	1.3%	0
Unemployed	33.0%	31.2%	48.7%
	100 %	100 %	100 %

NOTE: Of 431 participants, JAT was unable to contact 63; 32 had moved from the area. Data reflects information available on 336 participants.

APPENDIX III

APPENDIX IV

PROCEDURE USED FOR ESTIMATING THE NUMBER OF POTENTIAL JAT ENROLLEES EXISTING IN THE ANTIOCH/PITTSBURG AREA DURING THE TWO YEARS OF JAT'S OPERATION

From the research subcontractor's study of U.I. claims it was estimated that 1700 workers in the area filed new U.I. claims and thus experienced layoffs of two or more weeks duration during 1971.

To estimate the number of layoffs for JAT's other 12 months of operation, it can be assumed there were again somewhere in the area of 1700 U.I. claims filed, since unemployment held steady at the same high levels during both years of the experiment. Local U.I. statistics show that 60% of claims in a given year are "repeaters" ... that proportion of all recipients who also had a claim in the previous year. Such workers are those in canning, construction and similar seasonal industries. By adjusting the base figure of 1700 downward by 60%, to avoid a double count of "repeaters," it can be estimated that there were roughly 680 laid-off workers in JAT's other 12 months of operation who were distinct from the 1700 for 1971.

Thus, it is estimated that 2380 distinct individuals filed U.I. claims in the Pittsburg/Antioch area over the two-year life of the JAT experiment. Not all of these individuals can be considered potential JAT enrollees. Downward adjustments must be made for those who possess well-defined professional or technical skills and would not benefit from JAT, nor conceivably

consider enrolling (conservatively estimated at 20%); adjustments would also have to be made for those who experienced layoffs of short duration (less than four weeks) and would not have had much time to learn of, or consider enrolling in, JAT (estimated at 40%); further downward adjustments might also be reasonably made for those over 50 years of age who would give little consideration to "going back to school" with a lifetime of labor force experience behind them (estimated at 26%). Obviously, these categories overlap, in that a single person might fit into all of them. For example, a 50 year old master machinist who was laid off for less than four weeks.

From the data gathered by the research group, it is not possible to determine to what extent such overlap exists. It can be stated with confidence, however, that a single downward adjustment of 30% would be a very conservative factor to use in arriving at a rough estimate of the realistic size of the pool of potential enrollees that existed over the two years of the experiment. Such an adjustment results in a liberal estimate that there existed a pool of roughly 1650 laid-off workers who might have been enrolled in the program over its two year span.